

Application No.: 10/529,620
Amendment Dated: November 14, 2008
Reply to Office Action of: August 20, 2008

MTS-3512US

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-13 and 15 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 2, 5, 7 and 14 are cancelled.

Claims 11-13 were objected to for informalities. These informalities have been corrected. Withdraw of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 11-13 have been amended to recite a "... tangible computer readable recording medium ..." Withdraw of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2 and 4-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Moriyama et al. The rejection of claims 2, 5 and 7 are moot due to the cancellation of these claims. Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 1, includes features which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

... said first wireless communication unit further includes first wired connection detecting means configured to detect whether or not said wired connection is being performed between said first wired communication means and said second wired communication means...

... when said first wired connection detecting means detects that said wired connection is being performed, said first change-over means changes over so that said wired data communication is performed, and using the wired connection detected by said first detecting means, **gives a change-over instruction to said second change-over means** to change over so that said wired data communication is performed ... (Emphasis added).

Basis for the amendment may be found, for example, in claim 2 of the originally filed application.

Moriyama does not disclose or suggest "... said first change-over means changes over so that said wired data communication is performed, and using the wired connection detected by said first detecting means, gives a change-over instruction to said second change-over means to change over," as recited in claim 1.

Paragraph [0084] of Moriyama et al. recites:

FIG. 6 is a flowchart showing the connection mode switching operation of the processing apparatus 10. During this process, the wired connection mode and the wireless connection mode are switched. The CPU 11 of the processing apparatus 10 receives a signal from the detachment detector 42 in the cradle 40 via the wired data transfer line 21 (step 101), and determines whether the detachment state of the display device so has changed (step 102). When the detachment state is unchanged, program control returns to step 101. When the detachment state has changed, the state following the change is examined (step 103). When the display device 50 is mounted, the connection mode is shifted to the wired connection mode (step 104), and program control returns to step 101. When the display device 50 is disconnected (detached), the connection mode is shifted to the wireless connection mode (step 105) and program control returns to step 101. (Emphasis added).

Further, paragraph [0084] of Moriyama et al. recites:

[0105] FIG. 13 is a flowchart showing the connection mode switching process performed by the display device 50. To change the connection mode, the display device 50 obtains from the detachment detector 58 a signal indicating the detachment state (step 201), and determines whether the detachment state has changed (step 202). When the detachment state has not changed, program control returns to step 201, where a signal from the detachment detector 58 is waited for. When the detachment state is changed, how the state is changed is examined (step 203). When the display device 50 is attached to the cradle 40 by the connectors 51 and 41 and the connection of the wired connection path 20 is established, the connection mode is shifted to the wired connection mode (step 204). When the display device 50 is detached from the cradle 40, the mode is shifted to the wireless communication mode (step 205). Program control then returns to step 201. (Emphasis added).

Moriyama et al. includes a processing apparatus 10 (i.e. first communication unit), a display device 50 (i.e. second communication unit) and a cradle 40. (Fig. 1).

The display device 50 is wired to both the cradle 40 and the processing apparatus 10 when the display device 50 is attached to the cradle 40.

Moriyama et al. does not, however, disclose or suggest "a change over instruction," as recited in claim 1. By contrast, the connection mode switching operation of the processing apparatus 10 is performed based on the signal from the detachment detector 42, while the connection mode switching operation of the display device 50 is performed based on the signal from the detachment detector 58. See also Figs. 3-5 of Moriyama et al. Moriyama et al. does not, therefore, disclose "... said first change-over means changes over so that said wired data communication is performed, and using the wired connection detected by said first detecting means, gives a change-over instruction to said second change-over means to change over," as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over the art of record.

Claims 4, 6 and 8-10, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claims 4, 6 and 8-10 are also allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claims 11-13 depend from claims 8-10, respectively. Accordingly, claims 11-13 are allowable over the art of record.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Moriyama et al. and Fong. Claim 3 is allowable, however, because it depends from allowable claim 1.

Applicants note that a second reference is missing from the general rejection of claim 15 recited at item 10, page 13, last two lines of the Office Action. U.S. patent publication no. 2003/0207683 to Lempio et al., however, is recited at pages 16-17 of the Office Action and at row B of the Notice of References Cited, which is attached to the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants assume that claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Moriyama et al. and Lempio et al.

Claim 15, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. As described above, Moriyama et al. does not disclose the features of claim 1, namely, "... said first change-over means ... gives a

Application No.: 10/529,620
Amendment Dated: November 14, 2008
Reply to Office Action of: August 20, 2008

MTS-3512US

change-over instruction to said second change-over means to change over so that said wired data communication is performed." (Emphasis added).

The Office Action recites that "... it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the capability of the access point of Lempio's invention with the processing apparatus in Moriyama to accommodate multiple display devices. This rationale would have been that it is desired to allow the accommodation of multiple display devices to fully utilize the service provided by the processing apparatus." (Page17, lines 1-6). Lempio et al., however, does not disclose "... said first change-over means ... **gives a change-over instruction to said second change-over means** to change over so that said wired data communication is performed." (Emphasis added). Thus, claim 15 is allowable over the art of record.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Allan Ratner, Reg. No. 19,717
Attorney for Applicants

DFD/dfd/fp

Dated: November 14, 2008

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

NM337288